



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sexes, nature herself points out the female as the fitter of the two to undertake this charge ; for the same reason the care of the sick and infirm may be most properly entrusted to her. As a consequence of this it seems almost to follow that certain departments of the medical profession may be advantageously practised by females, either in common with, or in preference to the males. In many branches of literature already alluded to, they are in all respects as well qualified to engage as are those of the opposite sex. In certain professions, such as the legal, we can hardly wish to see the fair sex occupied, not from any doubt of their qualifications for success here,—where, when occasion has compelled them to come forward, it must be admitted that they have acquitted themselves with the highest credit,—but on account of the unseemly contentions which such a pursuit necessarily entails. In many business matters, the keeping of accounts, and the conduct of commercial transactions, women appear to be quite as well qualified to act, and are as successful as are the men.

Nevertheless, the result of the whole inquiry proposed as the subject of the present paper must be to convince us that there is, after all, an essential and extensive difference and inequality between persons of different sexes,—not by any means however one of uniform superiority on either side,—mental and moral as well as material, arising from a difference in material structure, in texture and temperament as well as organic, which no similarity of education can ever remove, no identity of circumstances can ever serve to annihilate. Indeed, any attempts of this kind, by bringing the two into immediate juxtaposition, only suffice to exhibit the more clearly, and to contrast more forcibly, the great and decided distinction, both mental and moral, which exists between them. Any efforts to obliterate this difference, or to assimilate the nature of the two, by engaging either in pursuits proper only for the other, are but attempts to violate nature, and as such can never be successful, except to prove the folly and the futility of all such exertions. Against undertakings of this kind the voice of nature, the experience of all time, and in all nations, savage as well as civilised, raise their decided protest. Change their pursuits, their studies, their style of education, as you may, male and female, in all their characteristics, in their dispositions and their capacities, will still exhibit the same peculiarities throughout, marked and distinct as ever. The current may be diverted, but its course will be still always downward. The laws of nature are too strong by far to allow of any vain efforts of ours either to diminish their power, or to elude their grasp.

The thanks of the meeting having been given to Mr. Harris, the following paper was then read—

On the Real Differences in the Minds of Men and Women. By
J. McGRIGOR ALLAN, Esq., F.A.S.L.

“In the normal condition of things, woman’s mission is not merely to bring forth children and to suckle them, but to attend to their early education; whilst the father must provide for the subsistence of the family. Everything that affects this normal order necessarily induces a perturbation in the evolution of races; and hence it follows that the condition of women in society must be carefully studied by the anthropologist.”—Broca on “Anthropology.”—*Anthrop. Review*, Jan. 1868.

Is woman intellectually the equal of man? Are there no natural mental distinctions between the sexes? Are the obvious differences in thought and action, observable between men and women, produced solely by education, or founded on nature? Is woman susceptible of the same mental training as man, and could a similar process of instruction remove all mental distinctions between the sexes, and enable woman to compete successfully with man in all kinds of intellectual labour? These questions, interesting in themselves, and profoundly important in the practical results depending on their solution, I propose to discuss in this limited paper. The subject is not only strictly anthropological, but eminently practical and popular. Few, if any, topics can prefer a prior claim on students of man-science, than this of the *status* of woman. All attempts to ascertain man's proper place in nature involve consideration of both sexes. The assertions and claims put forward under the term "Woman's Rights", are a challenge to anthropologists to consider the scientific question of woman's mental, moral, and physical qualities, her nature and normal condition relative to man. Nowhere, then, can the question be more appropriately and profitably discussed than in the Anthropological Society.

Fifteen years ago, my attention was directed to the Woman-question. I was then inclined to believe there was no radical distinction in mind between the sexes. In 1860, I published a small volume, *The Intellectual Severance of Men and Women*, in which I endeavoured to trace the faults of both sexes to a bad system of education. Greater experience and anthropological study enable me to see the error I made in regarding woman's position, socially and conventionally, without sufficiently attending to the scientific and physiological aspect of the question. "Woman's Rights" advocates are now preaching the equality of the sexes. Smart American ladies have "gone a-head" of equality; and adduce as a proof of the superiority of woman, "the greater complexity of woman's physical organisation." Chaste phrase! The British Transcendental School rests content with begging the whole question, by asserting as the basis of a total revolution in the sexual relations, the equality of man and woman.

To prevent misunderstanding, let us define our terms. What is meant by the glib assertion, that woman is the equal of man? Is she equal in size? No. In physical strength? No. In intellect? Yes, replies the advocate; and if she received the same training as man, she would demonstrate her intellectual equality and her moral superiority to her masculine tyrant. I deny this assertion; and proceed to show why woman is incapable of receiving a training similar to that of man. My position is, that *there must be radical, natural, permanent distinctions in the mental and moral conformation, corresponding with those in the physical organisation of the sexes.* Examine male and female skeletons; study men and women physiologically, pathologically, in health and disease; observe philosophically their respective pursuits, functions, pleasures, tastes, aspirations; recall the part which each sex has played in history; listen to the conversation of men and women in society; compare the sculptured forms of the antique, and the portraits of the two sexes; study and contrast

them artistically in the life-school ; observe men and women as they mingle in the daily scenes of the world ; and we shall find it difficult to accede to platform paradoxes,—that there is no sex in mind, and that the intellectual diversity of the sexes is due to education alone !

Man is an animal ; woman is the female of man. Although in some respects—such as grace, delicacy, beauty of form, complexion, etc.—woman appears to recede more from, in other respects she approaches more closely than man does, to the animal type ! Physically, for example, in the menstrual discharge,—if it be true that this is also a characteristic of female anthropoid apes, and of other mammalia. Mentally, the approach to the animal is more decided, and is seen in the superior instinct of woman compared with man. In reflective power, woman is utterly unable to compete with man ; but she possesses a compensating gift in her marvellous faculty of intuition. A woman will (by a power similar to that sort of semi-reason by which animals avoid what is hurtful, and seek what is necessary to their existence) arrive instantaneously at a correct opinion on a subject to which a man cannot attain, save by a long and complicated process of reasoning, and some error in that process entails a wrong conclusion. Place a profound philosopher and a simple woman in the same society: the woman, by some intuitive, and by her inexplicable power, will at once form a tolerably correct opinion of those present ; while our philosopher, after much reflection, and with all the aids of phrenology, physiognomy, and logic, will form an opinion quite as likely to be wrong as right. But educate a woman to the utmost of her capacity, and let her try conclusions with an uneducated man : place before them a problem in Euclid, the mechanism of a steam-engine, or any other study requiring reason ; the man's views will be more profound, broad, and luminous than those of the woman. You have deadened or destroyed by systematic training the woman's instinct of perceptivity, without being able to bestow, as an equivalent, the reasoning power of the man.

It is asserted with truth that, up to the age of puberty, there is little perceptible difference in male and female minds ; that the advantage, if any, is on the side of the girl. I deduce from this fact a conclusion quite opposed to that of mental equality of the sexes. In the animal and vegetable kingdoms we find this invariable law—rapidity of growth inversely proportionate to the degree of perfection at maturity. The higher the animal or plant in the scale of being, the more slowly does it reach its utmost capacity of development. Girls are physically and mentally more precocious than boys. The human female arrives sooner than the male at maturity, and furnishes one of the strongest arguments against the alleged equality of the sexes. The quicker appreciation of girls is the instinct, or intuitive faculty in operation ; while the slower boy is an example of the latent reasoning power not yet developed. Compare them in after-life, when the boy has become a young man full of intelligence, and the girl has been educated into a young lady reading novels, working crochet, and going into hysterics at sight of a mouse or a spider.

Sydney Smith endeavoured to explain the difference in the under-

standings of men and women, without referring to any conjectural differences of original mental conformation:—"As long as boys and girls run about in the dirt, and trundle hoops together, they are precisely alike. If you catch up one-half and train them to a particular set of actions, and the other half to a perfectly opposite set, their understandings will differ" accordingly. He thinks "there is no occasion to go into deeper or more abstract reasoning to explain so simple a phenomenon." This superficial view entirely ignores the influence of sexual organisation in the early determination of character, which explains *why* we catch up one-half and train them differently from the other half. It is not true that girls and boys are exactly alike in mind. The pursuits and games of boys differ materially from those of girls. That they have amusements in common is natural, and applies to adults as well. Yet even in childhood, sex has its characteristic tastes. Boys love activity, bustle, noise, drums, guns, swords, tops, balls, horses, carriages, etc. To play at horses, soldiers, hide-and-seek, hare and hounds, and other games in imitation of masculine cruelty, is their delight. Even at this tender age, we discover the combative and destructive propensities, whose future development will convert them into heroes and filibusters.

Girls love best playthings connected with personal appearance—looking-glasses, necklaces, earrings, ribbons, lace, etc.; above all, dolls. The doll is the special amusement of girls. In thus playing at maternity by anticipation, nature affords a strong and unerring intimation of the ultimate destiny of woman. Observe street-children assembled round an organ-grinder. We do not see boys and girls dancing indiscriminately in equal numbers. For one boy dancing, we may count fifty or a hundred girls—another strong natural bent of the female character exhibited in childhood.

For male and female there is no serious difference of opinion or object until the age of puberty. Then, how great the difference! The boy, springing into manhood, is at once and for ever developed, and, so far as sex is concerned, completed. Whereas the woman, for a period varying from twenty to thirty years, is an admirably constructed apparatus for the most mysterious and sublime of nature's mysteries—the reproductive process. The young man starts free; his sexual development once completed, all is accomplished: the young virgin is adapted for becoming a matrix, in which a process, involving her whole physique, may occur eighteen or twenty times within thirty years. Whether the menstrual discharge be peculiar to woman, or common to woman and other mammalia, it characterises women of all races in a normal state. Although the duration of the menstrual period differs greatly according to race, temperament, and health, it will be within the mark to state that women are unwell, from this cause, on the average two days in the month, or say one month in the year. At such times, women are unfit for any great mental or physical labour. They suffer under a languor and depression which disqualify them for thought or action, and render it extremely doubtful how far they can be considered responsible beings while the crisis lasts. Much of the inconsequent conduct of women, their pet-

ulance, caprice, and irritability, may be traced directly to this cause. It is not improbable that instances of feminine cruelty (which startle us as so inconsistent with the normal gentleness of the sex) are attributable to mental excitement caused by this periodical illness. The greater number of capricious acts of tyranny and blood, ordered, or personally committed by women possessed of despotic power, might be thus explained, and testify to the folly of trusting any woman with arbitrary authority. Imagine a woman, at such a time, having it in her power to sign the death-warrant of a rival or a faithless lover!

Delicate nervous women suffer, I think, longer than is generally supposed. Michelet defines woman as an invalid. Such she emphatically is, as compared with man. Woman is doubly entitled to man's protection; not only as smaller and weaker than himself, but as being, on account of her sex, more or less always unwell. Who does woman the greater service—he who ignores, or he who remembers this important physiological distinction between the sexes? This distinction is never mentioned on platforms, where men and women bray about the equality of the sexes; yet every medical man knows it underlies the whole question. This periodical illness of women is always ignored by theorists, whose object apparently is to produce an anti-scientific, superficial declamation to tickle the ears of groundlings; but it cannot be practically ignored with impunity. Outraged nature exacts a terrible retribution. Here, then, is to be sought the true cause of that predominance of the male intellect, ascribed by feminine frothy lecturers of both sexes to the tyrannical usurpation of man. Our sex, it is said, has used its only superior faculty, muscular strength, to trample upon woman,—to deprive her of her rights,—to treat her as a slave. This is the sort of stuff that goes down with mixed audiences, even in so-called semi-scientific societies. If government depend solely on superiority in physical strength, why is man the lord of creation? Why are we not ruled by lions, tigers, bulls, bears, elephants, and whales? Why does the gorilla still lurk in the forests of equatorial Africa, and not put in his claim to settle the affairs of Spain, or sit in Mr. Gladstone's cabinet?

Even if woman possessed a brain equal to man's—if her intellectual powers were equal to his—the eternal distinction in the physical organisation of the sexes would make the average man in the long run, the mental superior of the average woman. In intellectual labour, man has surpassed, does now, and always will surpass woman, for the obvious reason that nature does not periodically interrupt his thought and application. Where the constitution is sound, man is a powerful thinking machine, free to study daily, all the year round, during a long lifetime. Some men have died, literally of old age, without experiencing one day's illness, incredible as it may seem, without the aid of physicians; thereby showing an indifference for the faculty bordering on contempt. Still, facts are stubborn things; and there are, even in our highly civilised country, truly rural districts where doctors cannot make a living, owing to the bad habit persisted in by the natives, of never dying of any disease but that which terminated the life of Methuselah.

No analogous instance could be truthfully recorded of any woman. No woman ever passed through life without being ill. She suffers from "the custom of women", or she does not. In either case she is normally or abnormally ill. Thus every woman is, according to temperament and other circumstances, always more or less an invalid. Therefore, no woman can pursue uninterrupted physical or mental labour. Nature disables the whole sex, single as well as married, from competing on equal terms with man. Has woman powers of mind and body equally free and untrammelled with those of man? Will she voluntarily devote herself to abstract study and profound thought? or will she be more likely to have her ideas, wishes, and motives centred more immediately and naturally on what directly concerns herself physiologically, in relation to her important share in the grand function of reproduction? Great physical and mental exertion cannot go on at the same time in the same organism. Profound thinkers and philosophers are notoriously unprolific; and with very rare exceptions, their offspring are of inferior power. Can we imagine a woman, in an interesting situation, dividing her time between morning sickness and Malthus on Population,—between the not uncommon craving for old leather, indigestible fruit, or other disgusting aliment, and Liebig on the *Chemistry of Food*; shaping or sewing baby-linen, and meditating on a motive power to supersede steam; suffering all those flutterings, palpitations, whims, and fancies, frequent in the impregnated state, and plunging absorbedly into Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, Buckle's *Civilisation*, or Colenso on the *Pentateuch*?

Every physiologist knows that the health of an expectant mother imperatively demands rest, quiet, freedom from harassing cares, from bodily and mental toil. Women are already too prone to neglect the powerful hints of nature, that during the period of gestation, retirement is not only decorous, but a duty which they owe to themselves and their unborn children. It is superfluous to dwell on the importance of the maternal duties. The normal condition of woman being evidently marriage and maternity, it follows that women who fulfil this condition, and discharge thoroughly their conjugal and maternal duties, have neither time nor inclination to try to convert themselves into poor and imperfect copies of men. The functions of wife and mother are so essential, not only to the welfare but to the existence of the species,—so high and holy, that they cannot be abnegated or insufficiently discharged, without entailing the most disastrous consequences. Such abnegation, or failure, to quote Dr. Broca's words, "induces a perturbation in the evolution of races." We have an illustration of this in America, where, in the great cities on the Atlantic seaboard, the old American stock is actually dying out, in consequence of the disinclination of women to become mothers.* I cannot agree with the American authoress who attempts to base the asserted intellectual superiority of woman on the fact, that she has so much more to undergo in developing the child. The premises are correct; the conclusion drawn from them is absurd. On the contrary, in this important

* Hepworth Dixon's *New America*, vol. ii, ch. xxv, p. 265.

difference of sexual organisation, we see the true reason why man's realm is the intellect—woman's the affections.

Consider the all-important claims of maternal functions. The expectant mother is possessed by the most conflicting feelings—fear, hope, pleasure, pain ; natural personal apprehensions as to the results of the severe ordeal awaiting her, which may terminate in death to her, her child, or both ; or in a new and double life. The actual mother remembers no more her travail, for joy that she has given a man to the world. She is, or ought to be, employed in nourishing the helpless infant. To suppose that a woman, in either of these conditions, is able to unsex herself and change places with her husband, to undergo great physical and mental toil, or to undertake any task of which man is capable, from chopping wood to chopping logic, is a puerile conceit, which would not be worth serious refutation, were there not unfortunately men and women to teach, and audiences foolish enough to believe, the doctrine of sexual equality. Woman's instinct and wishes do not lead her in the purely intellectual direction. Her pleasures and duties are widely distinct from those of man. She is content, in most instances, to let others think for her, and trusts to that faculty, where she is really superior—her intuition—to discover the most proper person to do so. Nature has declared, in language which cannot deceive, that woman's chief mission is maternity. Woman craves to be a mother, knowing that she is an imperfect undeveloped being, until she has borne a child. There is a grand physiological truth expressed in the pathetic words of Rachel to Jacob : "Give me children, or else I die." The intrigues, displays, and piscatorial performances of manœuvring, match-making mammas and marriageable misses, are the results of such an instinct in our highly artificial social structure, where, unhappily, owing to the prejudice of British Philistines in favour of the large family system (which is simply a monopoly of love, marriage, and parentage), enforced celibacy is on the increase. Every normal woman desires to be married, and yearns for children, although, from a sublime deceit (also characteristic of feminine nature) she professes indifference and unwillingness to fulfil the great end of her existence. A feigned disinclination to celebrate the nuptial rites, and a simulated repulse, which increases the desires of the male, is common to almost all females of the higher mammalia, and constitutes another very remarkable point of resemblance between the human species and other animals.

Any attempt to fix woman's condition in society, without taking into account the peculiarities of her physical conformation, must be worthless ; and it is exactly woman's physical conformation which is utterly ignored by the advocates of sexual equality. To the transcendental school we may bequeath Fuseli's witty saying, "Damn Nature, she puts me out." The transcendentalist speaks of men and women as ideal beings, passing over as trivial the most important distinctions of sex. But we happen to possess bodies ; and so, after listening to the most vague rhapsodies of what woman will be in the future, the women of the present contentedly go on with their

crochet, and confine the exaltation of the sex to the elevation of their chignons. Any encroachment of one sex on the physical and mental characteristics of the other, is unnatural and repulsive to all well-constituted minds of men and women. A woman with a masculine mind, is as anomalous a creature, as a woman with a man's breasts, a man's pelvis, a man's muscular leg, or a man's beard.

Everyone perceives at a glance the remarkable distinctions in size and form of the sexes. Man is formed for strength; woman for grace and elegance. Man is taller and more robust; in woman, the muscular system is less than man's, and is concealed by a remarkable development of cellular tissue. Man's shoulders are considerably wider than his haunches; in woman, there is not much difference in the width of these parts. The proportions vary considerably according to race and individual. In well-formed women, the shoulders slightly exceed the pelvis in breadth. In some they are equal; while in women of Dutch build, and in some Negro women, the pelvis is considerably wider than the shoulders. In respect to narrowness of the pelvis, man is nearer the animal than woman. Although nature, in her normal productions, demarcates the sexes plainly to the most superficial observation, occasionally there are human hermaphrodites, in whom both sexes are so impartially mingled, that it is difficult to conclude whether male or female predominates, and under which gender to rank the individual. Without dwelling on such extreme cases, there are common instances of masculine women and feminine men, whether we judge such abnormal beings by a mental, moral, or physical standard. As women, in whom the uterus and ovaries remain inert during life, approximate in form and habits to men; so we might, by analogy, conclude that some effeminate men make a reciprocal approach in their form, habits, and modes of thinking to women. Some might be disposed to attribute to Miss Lydia Becker a deep and subtle irony in the very title of her celebrated paper "On the supposed Differences in the Minds of the two Sexes of Man." The physiologist might agree with a critic in the *Saturday Review*, that there are indisputably two sexes of man, who may be recognised by their appearance, and their normal or abnormal relations to women.

Thus, the cooperation and *entente cordiale* between masculine women and feminine men, as advocates of sexual equality, are natural and intelligible facts, and in no way contradict the axiom, that in friendship and in love, individuals seek their opposites and contrasts, not their copies. For example, an eminently masculine man,—a big, rough, hairy, he-creature, brave as a lion, strong as a horse, with the digestion of an ostrich, and a beard like a bull-buffalo's,—almost invariably selects as a mate some soft, gentle, yielding, thoroughly feminine woman; while a masculine woman, who preaches on a platform the doctrine of sexual equality, practically endorses her views by marrying some poor, insignificant, nondescript creature, who will never dispute the supremacy of his liege lady, whether she wishes to stand in her husband's shoes or his unmentionables. How, otherwise, do we account for the fact, that intellectual ladies either remain single, or else own hen-pecked

husbands? I fear we must answer in the affirmative Byron's polite inquiry,—

“But, O ye lords of ladies intellectual,
Inform us truly, have they not hen-pecked you all?”

Scott has made, I think, a remarkable anthropological error, in marrying Count Robert of Paris to a virago, an imperfect copy and outrageous caricature of her husband.*

Mr. Alexander Walker tells us, “The vital system is peculiarly that of woman: any great employment of the locomotive or mental organs, deranges the peculiar functions of woman, and destroys the characteristics of her sex. Women who greatly occupy the locomotive organs, acquire a coarse and masculine appearance: so well is this incompatibility of power in the use of locomotive organs, with the exercise of vital ones, known to the best female dancers, that, during their engagements, they generally live apart from their husbands. As to intellectual ladies, they seldom become mothers, or they become intellectual when they cease to be mothers. These few facts are worth a thousand hypotheses and dreams, however amiable they may be.”† As a supplement to Walker's observation, the incompatibility of intellectual pursuits with the laborious profession of a dancer, is illustrated in the French proverb: “*Bête comme une danseuse.*”

In comparing the organic structure, the relative size and conformation of the crania and brains of the sexes, must necessarily be considered. Walker says that though in woman the whole head is proportionately less than in man, yet the organs of sense are proportionably larger. Upon this proportional development, he thinks, depend that increased sensibility and quickness of observation essential to the female character. This is another analogy between woman and the animal, in which the organs of sense, as compared with the brain proper, are much larger than in the human species.‡ Here, possibly we may have the true physiological cause of the daily experienced observation, that man is a being of the intellect—woman of instinct; that man reasons—woman feels. Walker concludes that women are less guided by intellect, and are more biassed by feeling and emotion, to fulfil which all their movements are more easy and prompt, though less sustained, increased by ready obedience of muscular action and relative shortness of stature. This easier and less forcible action is conformable physically with the small and elongated cerebel, or organ

* This novel was written after repeated shocks of paralysis and apoplexy, and almost the last, if not the last, work of the author. We may thus account for the oversight of a genius so signally correct in his delineations of human nature, that he deserves the title of *The Anthropologist of Fiction.*

† *Analysis of Beauty*, p. 214.

‡ Ratio of mass of brain to bulk of nerves arising from it: *vide* Lawrence, *Lectures*, p. 178. “Dividing the brain into two parts: that immediately connected with the sensorial extremities of the nerves, which receive their impressions, and is therefore devoted to wants and purposes common to us and animals. The other division may be considered the seat of mental phenomena, or brain proper. In the proportional development of this latter and more noble part, man is decidedly pre-eminent. Though in his senses and common animal properties, he holds only a middle rank, here he surpasses all other animals hitherto investigated: he is the first of living beings.”

of will, and morally with woman's part in life, and her desire to please; while man's is to protect and defend. Agreeably to her form and size of brain, woman's disposition to sustain exertion, mental or bodily, is much less; hence the character "*varium et mutabile semper fœmina*." Woman's prompt and easily affected sensibility, not her understanding or force of mind, renders her eminently fit to be interested in infancy, enables her to surmount maternal pains through affection and pity, and interests her in the cares and details of house-keeping. It is this that sometimes renders nothing too irksome or too powerful for a mother, wife, or mistress, to endure. Hence, woman's constitution is perfectly adapted to those functions; her existence is more sedentary than man's; she has more gentleness of character, and is less acquainted with great crimes.*

Carl Vogt gives the following proportions of the female skull:— "Assuming the male = 100 throughout,—circumference = 96.6, capacity = 89.7, weight of brain = 89.9. Outlines of female head are rounder, facial portion of skull, especially jaws and base of skull, smaller, the latter being especially narrower in posterior section. The base more extended, sella-angle larger; and there is developed in the female a striking tendency to prognathism and to dolichocephaly. The type of the female skull approaches in many respects that of the infant, and still more that of the lower races; with this is connected the remarkable circumstance, that the difference between the sexes, as regards cranial cavity, increases with the development of race, so that the male European excels much more the female than the negro the negress, &c. Among peoples progressing in civilisation men are in advance of women; among those retrograding, the contrary is the case. As in morals, woman is the conservator of old customs, usages, traditions, legends, and religions; so in the material world, she preserves primitive forms which slowly yield to the influences of civilisation. It is easier to overthrow a government by revolution than alter the arrangements in the kitchen, though their absurdity be abundantly proved. Woman preserves in the formation of the head, the earlier stage from which the race or tribe has been developed, or into which it has relapsed; hence is partly explained the fact, that inequality of the sexes increases with the progress of civilisation."†

Professor Ecker thinks:—"With reference to the proportion of the skull to the rest of the skeleton, in both sexes, we possess but few data by anatomists. Sœmmering says, in the male body, the head in proportion to the rest of the skeleton, is in weight = 1 : 8 or 10, in the female = 1 : 6, and that it is, therefore, relatively larger in the female. Accurate measurements are yet wanting, but the statements of artists confirm it, and the entire habitus of the female agrees with it."‡

Artists generally divide the male figure into eight heads, and the female into seven heads and a half. In woman the infantile type of head is apparent in the smallness of the features relatively to the skull, and in the predominance of the cranial roof over the cranial base, or

* *Analysis*, p. 240.

† Vogt's *Lectures on Man*, p. 81.

‡ Ecker "On the Form of the Female Skull," *Anthrop. Rev.*, Oct. 1868.

perpendicular forehead. Another characteristic of the female skull is its less height in comparison with the male skull. Ancient Greek sculptors* perfectly understood this distinction in the cranial contour of the sexes, and never gave to women generally the lofty, massive, angular brows so lavishly bestowed on the statues of statesmen, philosophers, poets, historians, heroes, and gods. A perpendicular frontal profile (orthomètopy) must not be confounded with a perpendicular facial profile (orthognathism). By the courtesy of Dr. Carter Blake, I verified the fact that a skull may possess a beautiful frontal profile, and yet exhibit most decided prognathism. Thus the two statements of Welcker, that woman displays the infantile type in perpendicularity of forehead, and that she displays a decided tendency to prognathism, are quite consistent; although I am under the impression that a retreating forehead and projecting jaws generally go together, and *vice-versâ*, that orthomètopy is generally accompanied by orthognathism. We must not confound a prominent forehead with a lofty or wide forehead: the former characterises the child and the woman, the latter characterises man. Camper's facial angle is a very uncertain measure of intelligence; according to it alone, the child would stand higher than the man, and perhaps it would be a fair question to ask phrenologists, why the child (whose brain is, relatively to its body, so much larger than that of the adult,) does not surpass man in intellect? "If," says Welcker, "skulls are ranged according to Camper's angle, the skull of the infant, contrasted with that of any animal, occupies a higher place than the skull of the adult; but if the skulls are ranged according to the increasing angle of the sella the series stands.—man, woman, child, animal."†

In man, we are so accustomed to associate frontal development of skull with intellectual power, that we hardly ever complain of exaggeration or disproportion caused by a brow very lofty or wide. In the female head we cannot dispense with symmetry and proportion, and consequently female features, otherwise handsome, are only affected less injuriously by a forehead very high and wide, than by a forehead "villainously low." The human head and face, as seen in front, are tolerably well defined in outline by the form of an egg: the big end represents the skull, the little end the chin; the short diameter of the egg will give the position for the eyes. In man, if the part above the eyes be greater than that below, we see nothing objectionable, because we associate this excess of coronal elevation with intellectual or

* Not Greek sculptors only, but the Romans as well. Horace says of Lycoris, "*Insignem tenui fronte*"; Petronius of Circe, "*frons minima*". The Roman ladies used to hide a portion of their foreheads under narrow bands (or ribbons) called "*nimbæ*", so generally was a narrow forehead considered the perfection of feminine beauty.—(E. V.) Mr. A. thanks the writer of this note. *Nimbatus*, "wearing false hair to make the female forehead seem smaller." Alluding to this custom, Plautus writes: "*Quam magis adspecto, tam magis est nimbatâ*."

† Vogt's *Lectures*, p. 44. The *sella turcica*, "Turkish saddle," is formed by a depression in the sphenoid bone. The sellar angle is determined by three points—the root of nose at junction of nasal and frontal bone, the anterior margin of occipital foramen, and the pommel of the saddle (olivary process), p. 42. Consult diagrams.

moral qualities, especially characteristic of the masculine nature. But in woman's head this excess in the superior region would immediately strike the judicious observer, or practical physiognomist, as a fault in beauty, for which the corresponding masculine qualities could not compensate. A study of antique sculpture and careful observation of the heads of men and women, will, I think, enable anthropologists to verify these remarks. Alluding to the *Venus de Medici*, Mr. Walker observes,* "The size of the head is sufficiently small to leave that predominance to the vital organs in the chest, which makes the nutritive system peculiarly that of woman. This is the first and most striking proof of the profound knowledge of the artist, the principles of whose art taught him that the vast head, on the contrary, was the characteristic of a very different female personage. Phrenologists have told us that the head of this *Venus* is too small; they might as well have said that the head of the *Minerva*, or of the *Jupiter*, is too large, or a hundred other ignorant inapplicabilities and ridiculous pedantries. To set aside ideal forms, sex makes a vast difference in the head, and a woman with a small head often produces a son with a large one."

Whether woman's brain be larger or heavier relatively to her body than man's, I have endeavoured to show why, in intellectual power, woman will always fall far short of man, owing to the important distinction in physical organisation between the sexes. In man we have a being formed expressly for undergoing long-sustained mental and physical labour. In woman, nature has produced a being whose principal functions are evidently intended to be love, leading to gestation, parturition, and nutrition. The whole form of woman, carefully and judiciously considered, testifies to the grand purpose of her existence. Her exquisitely perfect organisation is fashioned to aid directly and indirectly, the function of reproduction; nature seems to have combined in perfection, utility and attractiveness in woman. The beauty so liberally lavished on the female form (while it results directly from the adaptation of her structure to her special sexual functions,) is manifestly intended to charm and allure man so as to bring these functions into operation. Her indescribable graces, and the accomplishments of which her sex is exclusively susceptible, take captive her fierce conqueror, neutralising the otherwise disastrous consequences which might result from the weakness of woman, and the mere brutal strength of man. While woman yields in appearance, she disarms her would-be tyrant, and the weaker establishes a real and permanent supremacy over the stronger sex; not less real and permanent that it is continually and effectually disguised! Thus does nature obtain her object—the perpetuation of the species, for in spite of all the nonsense uttered and written on the subject, woman's mission is *maternity*.

Woman's beauty counterbalances the direct advantage of man's physical and intellectual superiority; inspires poet, painter, sculptor; robs sexual passion of its purely animal aspect; warms the imagination of the philosopher, while physiologist and anthropologist acknowledge its important agency in perpetuating the human species. Knox says: "In woman's form I see the perfection of nature's works, the

* Walker's *Analysis of Beauty*, p. 340.

absolutely perfect, the beautiful, the highest manifestation of abstract life, clothed in a physical form, adapted to the corresponding wants of her race and species.”* Hercules at the feet of Omphale, Samson succumbing to Delilah, Antony losing the world for Cleopatra; the British vestryman subsiding into marital insignificance at his own fireside; the typical Englishmen, while boasting that his house is his castle, standing in undisguised awe of his wife; the burly “navvy” letting his little wife beat him, and saying, “It pleases her and it don’t hurt me,” are a few of the illustrations which might be multiplied to show the folly of the platform cant about the tyranny of man, and the slavery of woman. Police reports certainly state that some husbands occasionally kick and beat their wives, but such brutality is exceptional. Amongst the humbler classes the “missis” is a very formidable personage, and frequently rules the husband despotically, often, it must be admitted, for his own good.

I proceed briefly to examine the assertion that women are beginning to rival men successfully in the fields of intellectual labour, put forward as a triumphant reply to the opponents of sexual equality. The practical proofs of woman’s mental power, are exactly in kind and degree, in quality and quantity, in accordance with the foregoing analysis of her intellectual capacity. In the lighter departments of literature women are diligent workers; as a general rule, natural sterility is accompanied with literary fertility. Single women are the best writers. As novelists, so far as popularity is a test of merit, women are running our sex very hard. But popularity is not the best test of merit;† I cannot admit that even in fiction, where women excel, that the best female novelists are to be compared with the masters of the craft. Women are not first-rate novelists; amongst lady novelists we look in vain for names to be compared with those of Cervantes, Le Sage, Sterne, Fielding, Richardson, Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Balzac, Bulwer Lytton, Cooper, Marryat, and many more. A female novel can generally be detected by the failure in the attempt to draw masculine character, and describe the conversation of men among themselves; their heroes are often mere lay-figures, dressed-up portraits, with about as much flesh and blood as might be found in one of Madame Tussaud’s wax figures—mere caricatures of real living men. It requires the highest order of genius to depict successfully a character of the other sex. As there are a thousand men of genius for one woman of genius, men are more successful in delineating women than women are in delineating men. There never was a woman who could look into the heart of man as Shakespeare has looked into the female heart. There is not a woman who could give us studies of men and women, such as have been bequeathed to the comprehensive anthropologist, in the novels of Scott, Balzac, and Thackeray. We can count our good female novelists on our fingers. As to the “ruck” of female fiction-writers, they may be divided broadly into two classes—authors of “goody” novels, which are beneath criticism; and naughty novels, which are only not contemptible, because

* *Races of Man*, p. 38.

† The novel which has had the largest circulation, within the last twenty years, is *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*.

of their excessive immorality. Talk of *Don Juan* indeed ! An ordinary fashionable "she" novel circulates a moral poison, more practically pernicious and destructive of all purity of principle in the rising generation which batten on such garbage, than the open obscenity of Holywell Street which comes under Lord Campbell's Act. After excepting women of genius and talent, who write good novels and excel in other departments of literature, we might say that for every woman thus legitimately and usefully employed, there are at least fifty women writing nonsense and worse than nonsense, puffed up with the flattery of complacent critics, and imbued with the idea that they are very clever, who would act wisely and profitably for themselves, their families, and their readers, by exchanging the pen for the needle, the writing-desk for the piano, or sewing-machine. Let those women who attribute this opinion to masculine envy and fear of female rivalry, ponder the advice to an intending female author in Mrs. Barrett Browning's *Aurora Leigh* (pp. 48, 52). The generality of those esteemed wonderfully clever women impose on none but fools ; the acute critic soon detects in the second-hand vamped-up style of her books, the masculine authority who guides the female author's pen, the discreet man of the world who furnishes her with the details of club-life, or the man of letters who secretly dictates her oracles, and manufactures to order her *impromptu bons mots* and happy thoughts.

There are some very good female artists. Mlle. Rosa Bonheur is for France what Sir Edwin Landseer is for England, the Raphael of animals ; but in the highest branches of painting woman does not rival man. Music is the most popular and universal of female accomplishments, and here, so far as the creative power is concerned, the deficiency of women is a remarkable and significant fact. Where are the great female composers to be named with Handel, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Rossini, Verdi, and a host of other immortal names ? Music as an art, both vocal and instrumental, constitutes, very properly, the principal accomplishment of young ladies. To play and sing will always form important parts of a young lady's education, and contribute greatly to the charms of home ; although, even here, it is to be regretted that parents consult only the fashion, without considering individual inclination and capacity. Time and money are wasted in the futile attempt to make many girls proficient in music, while some valuable faculty is lying dormant and undeveloped.

With regard to public professions, the stage perhaps offers the most legitimate field for the display of female energy and talent, whatever moralists may say to the contrary. We have ample evidence that women excel as singers, dancers, and actresses ; in all these departments of executive art, woman follows her natural vocation, and gratifies her passion for exhibiting herself, and attracting the admiration of the other sex of man. She does the same when she displays her charms and her accomplishments, and a good deal of her person, in a ball-room ; there, also, business and pleasure are united ; the ultimate object being marriage, in which wealth and position are more coveted than a congenial mind. Female triumphs of the play, the opera, the ballet, do not in any way interfere with those of male performers,

since there can be no rivalry where there can be no exchange of *métier*. As a dancer woman far surpasses man, not only in the natural grace and elegance of her attitudes and movements, but also in lightness and activity. This is accounted for by the fact that, though generally man's muscular system is better developed than woman's, in some parts the muscles are more developed in woman than in man. Mr. Walker observes that, "the muscles of the thighs in woman, having larger origins from the pelvis and being less compressed by contact, have more liberty to extend themselves. Their thighs are consequently remarkable for voluptuous fulness, softness of outline, and exquisite polish; from this results much of the delicacy of the female form, ease, suppleness, and grace in its movements."^{*}

As already observed, woman shows in girlhood an aptitude for dancing which man does not possess. But the profession of all others for which woman seems specially adapted is that of an actress! For this pursuit woman is qualified by natural instinct, and by that second nature, habit. Subjected all her life to a being mentally and physically stronger than herself, whose taste she must consult and whom she must study to please, striving continually to attain her ends by indirect means; to have her own way when she appears most willing to yield; to govern him whom she has solemnly sworn to obey, woman becomes gradually an adept in dissimulation. All women are more or less actresses! Shakespeare has, indeed, told us that we are all, men and women, players on the great stage of the world. It must be confessed that if we regard acting in this universal sense, man is here surpassed by woman. I admit that in the art of disguising her sentiments, passively appearing to be what she is not, and of actively personating the very opposite of what she really is, woman is far superior to man! Take lying, for instance: the worst of men often falters at telling a deliberate untruth; if he does lie, he does it in such a clumsy way as to show that he is ashamed of the unmanly vice, and he is easily detected. I have heard a lady urge as a proof of men's stupidity, that they did not know how to dissimulate like women. I give this as evidence that the generality of women are perfectly aware, and derive a secret satisfaction from the conviction, that they circumvent men by cunning and deception, although they strenuously deny the fact. Their superiority in this respect is well expressed by Byron:—

"Now what I love in woman is, they won't
Or can't do otherwise than lie, but do it
So well, the very truth seems falsehood to it."

With respect to the stage, as it is impossible for one sex to trespass on the *rôle* of the other, we enjoy the gratification of witnessing a well acted play, or hearing a well-executed opera, with the agreeable assurance that the rivalry of sex is not of an invidious character. Hamlet cannot change parts with Ophelia; nor can tenor and bass covet the applause bestowed on soprano and contralto. Language cannot describe the powerful influence exerted by a fine female voice in singing. Woman, then, is most legitimately employed as dancer, vocalist, and actress.

^{*} *Analysis*, by Walker.

In the highest realms of literature and science, man reigns supreme. The inventing, discovering, creating, cogitating mind is pre-eminently masculine; the history of humanity is conclusive as to the mental supremacy of the male sex. Men carry on the business of the world in the two great departments—*thought* and *action*; the ideas on which depend all the marvellous acts of human intelligence, the discoveries in physical science, which have raised man from a savage to a civilised being; the jurisprudence, political, civil, military, and religious institutions which maintain the social structure, are all produced and elaborated by men. In the domain of pure intellect it is doubtful if women have contributed one profound original idea of the slightest permanent value to the world! Not only as thinkers, but as workers, are men pre-eminent. Men legislate, govern, invent, colonise, make religions, fight, build, and dig. So little demand is there for the direct assistance of women in the mental departments which are the special province of man, that could all the male intellect in the world be suddenly paralysed or annihilated, there is not sufficient development of the abstract principles of justice, morality, truth, or of causality and inventive power in the female sex, to hold the mechanism of society together for one week. Truly does Mr. Charles Reade write: “In matters intellectual and moral, the long strain it is that beats them dead. Do not look for a Bacon, a Newton, a Handell, a Victoria Hugo. Some American ladies tell us education has stopped the growth of these. No! Mesdames, these are not in nature. They can bubble letters in ten minutes, which you could no more deliver than a river can play like a fountain. They can sparkle gems of stories, they can flash little diamonds of poems. The entire sex has never produced one opera or one epic that mankind could tolerate for a minute, and why? These come by long high-strung labour.”

Our opponents assert that woman is intellectually *equal*, while morally *superior* to man; I think, with Warburton, that “the sum of virtue in the female world does, from many accidental causes, far exceed the sum of virtue in the male;” but I cannot admit that woman is morally better than man. A little child is, in one sense, more innocent than his father, because too young to be tainted with sin, but the child does not know what morality means. Woman preserves the infantile type in plumpness, smoothness of skin, and proportions of the head and face. Physically, mentally and morally, woman is a kind of adult child. This is quite consistent with the highest respect for those qualities in which woman transcends man; for, as a wise pagan has said: “The greatest reverence is due to a child.” Man is the head of creation. The highest examples of physical, mental, and moral excellence are found in man. Miss Muloch admits that, “A truly good man, from the higher capacities of the male nature, both for virtue and vice, is, in one sense, more good than any good woman.”

There never was, and there never will be, a period or a people, where the morality of one sex will be in marked contrast to that of the other. Men and women are too intimately connected by nature and intercourse; they act and react far too powerfully on each other, to present any such miraculous phenomenon. One sex may be a little better

than the other, but it is probable that if one sex seem a great deal better, it is in reality a great deal worse than the other, by adding consummate hypocrisy to other sins! Neither sex can be isolated in good or evil. If woman be not all that good men wish her to be; if she affords some scope for the satirical remark, that "she is a good idea spoiled"; it is because she faithfully reflects masculine failings, foibles, virtues, and vices. Woman takes man as her exemplar, and it must be confessed she does not always get the best possible example. Though woman, in *theory*, stoutly proclaims her independence of man as an exemplar, this is but superficial seeming. Calling herself (in obedience to the new lights) man's intellectual equal, and moral superior, woman practically copies man slavishly, directly and indirectly consulting his tastes and wishes, or what she imagines them to be; for she is utterly at a loss to fathom the depth of man's character in the abstract; hence her charming inconsistency in the attempt to be consistent. Woman has, indeed, no method of knowing right from wrong, but by implicitly receiving man's dogmatic *dicta* on every question of religion, morals, and the practical conduct of life. She is as utterly incapable of giving a reason for her belief, or the principles which regulate her life, as of inventing a system of morals, or writing books like the *Iliad*, Newton's *Principia*, or Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding*.

Women are utterly deficient in the highest quality of the human mind—*Justice*! They never see two sides of a question: a woman makes a firm friend, an unrelenting enemy. In a lawsuit I should like for my advocate "a sweet girl-graduate with golden hair," who might gain my cause by making an impression on an intelligent British jury. But imagine a strong-minded female on the bench, summing up in a case of divorce, or in any case where the rights of the sexes were at variance! Law would, indeed, have new terrors—but I shall not pursue a subject which is too serious for a jest.

The natural and eternal subordination of woman to man, is strikingly exemplified in her exaggerated admiration for the masculine prerogatives—strength and intellect. To the magical influence of the latter power woman has ever been more abjectly subject than man. Were intellectual equality of the sexes not a mere idle dream, it would long ago have produced practical results; the strong-minded female would ere this have made good her pretensions. Woman's freedom, individuality, and independent action in matters of importance, are far more apparent than real in civilised countries. Savage life shows a much nearer approach to sexual equality, physical, mental, and moral. In Europe and America, almost every woman is steered through life by the reflecting brain, the strong will, and protecting arm of a husband, a father, a brother, or a son. If a woman have no male relative, she has her spiritual director, whether Catholic or Protestant, her father confessor or her favourite preacher, who keeps her conscience and whom she regards as a demi-god. If there be one woman without such a director, she is guided by man-made public opinion, supplemented by oracles uttered by men in past ages. Woman never escapes from masculine control, direct or indirect, personal or impersonal;

she is always ruled by some man or men, either living or governing from the grave. However superior in the estimation of her own sex, however strong-minded and intellectually independent a woman may really be, she embodies her ideal of masculine superiority in some man, to whose teachings—oral, written, or printed—delivered from arm-chair, pulpit, or platform, she listens with implicit reverence, making him, to all intents and purposes, an infallible pope from whose dictation there is no appeal. The adoration of the devotee being sometimes misplaced, does not invalidate the significance of the fact, of which I leave the advocates of sexual equality to make the best they can. Mentally and morally, the female is prostrate before the male sex, although the meek idolator often adores a brazen god!

To those who ask, What is woman's mission? Nature prompts a reply in one word—Maternity! It is woman's great function, and it should be her proud privilege, that she can bear and rear children to be men. Is it not a glorious mission to be a wife and mother? In solacing their husbands, giving them healthy children, and superintending their education, do not women discharge to the utmost their share of duties? Is there any possible way by which women in general could fulfil their vocation better, or more effectually aid in advancing human happiness, racial and national progress? To the advocates of equality I say, that the women who discharge the conjugal and maternal functions properly—those woman who are old-fashioned enough to find their happiness in promoting the happiness of their husbands and families, are not only the finest specimens of their sex in every point of view, but are working far more directly and efficiently for the physical, mental, and moral progress of the human species, than the superficial, flat-chested, thin-voiced Amazons, who are pouring forth sickening prate about the tyranny of man and the slavery of woman! In fulfilling her natural and normal functions, woman does everything; so long as she acts this, she is indeed a pure, beautiful, high, holy being. The future of every man-child mainly depends on the straightness of his legs, the robustness of his body, the strength of his constitution, the bias given to his mind by early maternal training. Thus the career of the man is not only to a great extent determined by the mother's care, but may be said to be influenced for good or ill by the mother's conduct, before the child sees the light!

Compare the true woman, who recognises the value and importance of the natural functions in their influence on future generations, with the little creature who "shunts" the conjugal and maternal duties; who rebels against the very instincts of Nature; who is, forsooth, ashamed of being a woman, and in aping man, becomes a nondescript—a monster more horrible than that created by Frankenstein. Is it possible to conceive a more contemptible and deplorable spectacle than that of the female (I will not profane the beautiful name of *woman*) who, having undertaken, and having appointed to her, by nature, those functions, in the proper fulfilment of which consist the charm and glory of the sex, deliberately neglects and abdicates the sacred duties and privileges of wife and mother, to make herself ridiculous by meddling in and muddling men's work? Let the being who has thus

morally, mentally, and physically, as far as possible, unsexed herself, be consistent, and imitate the example of American ladies, who, in laying aside womanly grace and modesty, have also laid aside the garb of woman.

The old schoolmaster in Adam Bede said, "There is only one thing women can do, that men cannot—bear children—and that they do in a poor makeshift sort of a way. Better it had been left to the men!" Advocates of sexual equality seem to make light of, or utterly ignore, woman's mission of maternity. In order that the new doctrines may become practical, some important revolutions in the existing functions of the sexes must occur. Either, sex must be abolished altogether, and some more delicate way of perpetuating the human species invented; or men and women must be constituted so that men can take their share in the labours of gestation, parturition, and nutrition, now devolved solely on woman by the tyranny of man! If a man and his wife could take turn and turn about in bearing children, the large family system would be rapidly abolished, and we should rarely see a family consisting of more than three children. Nature seems to think that she has advanced in the scale of being when she separates the sexes; but this does not appear to accord with the views of the transcendental school, whose principle of sexual equality cannot be reduced to practice, so long as maternity remains the exclusive function of one sex. I beg to draw the attention of medical women to this difficulty, which Nature, with true feminine obstinacy, persists in throwing in the way of the reformers who ascribe all woman's disabilities to the injustice of man! We live in an age of progress, especially our Yankee cousins! What might not steam effect in destroying the present unjust and onerous division of labour, especially if some smart American lady in man's costume would turn her attention to the delicate subject. Anthropologists of the future might hear some lady physician—in reference to the present faulty arrangement which confines child-bearing to women—say, in the immortal words of Molière's "Mock Doctor," "*Nous avons changé tout cela.*"

Common sense disposes of intellectual equality of the sexes. We cannot accept the *dicta* of strong-minded women, who either mistake their own restless wishes and caprices for the deliberate views of women in general, or who are determined to achieve notoriety at any price! We dare not ignore all lessons of experience, because some unhappy wives, and discontented virgins tell us, that all past generations have utterly misconceived woman's nature and capacities! Thousands of years have amply demonstrated the mental supremacy of man, and any attempt to revolutionise the education and *status* of woman on the assumption of an imaginary sexual equality, would be at variance with the normal order of things, and, as Dr. Broca says, induce "a perturbation in the evolution of races." I have endeavoured to trace the true, irrevocable, everlasting, natural source of the practical and beneficial division of duties between men and women. I have tried to show that there must be radical, natural, permanent, distinctions in the mental and moral conformation, corresponding with those in the physical organisation of the sexes. Out upon this selfish

whimpering of masculine women and feminine men, who, in ignorance or wilful blindness, ascribe the obvious results of physical distinctions, the eternal fiat of Nature, to the tyranny of man! As if man had been for forty centuries deliberately bent upon injuring woman—his sister, daughter, wife, mother! charging on our masculine ancestors a moral obtuseness, a short-sighted selfish policy, with no other object but to break and cow the spirit of woman. Whether we regard the respect shown to women by the ancient Germans, the deification of the sex in pagan religions, or the courtesy received by women in the days of chivalry, and still insisted on among all well-bred people, history utterly refutes such a fatal and distorted assumption.

As for some androgynists raving about woman's mission, intellectual equality, and moral superiority of woman, etc., it is quite evident that under the battle-cry of mental equality of the sexes, they are contending really for empire for themselves. They do not want to be treated on an equality with man. They desire the masculine in addition to the feminine privileges—a man's liberty added to a woman's non-responsibility! They demand the rights of a citizen, knowing they cannot be called on to discharge a citizen's duties. They claim every privilege of man, while refusing to surrender a single privilege conceded to them as women! At the very instant that such a logical female declares herself the equal of man, she would resent as ungentlemanly, unmanly, cowardly, the attempt of any man to take her at her word, and treat her in every respect like one of his own sex? She is a stickler for all the courtesies and conventional amenities, which the stronger observes towards the weaker sex as a matter of course, and which depend solely on the inequality of the sexes, thus screaming in the same breath—equality and inferiority! The masculine woman, when she thinks anything is to be got, cries out, "I am man's equal!" "There is no distinction between the sexes!" Indeed! then turn out from the chimney-corner, lounge no longer on sofa or ottoman, but away into the world, and take your share, lady, in the rough work of men without fear or favour. Hear a lady, sheltered from cradle to grave, from all the storms which beat on the bare heads of millions of both sexes; housed, fed, clothed in luxury, zealously guarded from any unpleasant contact with the stern realities of life; hear such a lady regretting that she does not enjoy man's privileges! Let her disguise herself in man's apparel and learn what these privileges are. How glad she would be to return to her own costume! The masculine woman takes good care to entrench herself in all the feminine outworks of propriety, civility, attention, gallantry, deference, and those still more solid exactions demanded by the sex in right of its weakness, and cheerfully paid by all gentlemen to all gentlewomen, who know how to make their sex respected. The nondescript androgynous creatures illustrate the fable of the jackdaw in peacock's feathers. They want to usurp our sexual advantages without surrendering their own, and necessarily fail to achieve such an impossible combination. They want to be both men and women, and they are consequently neither the one nor the other.*

* A female entered a railway carriage in America, and looked about for a seat, evidently expecting some chivalrous Yankee to vacate in her favour.

As for platform orators of both sexes—"Let them rave!" If the masculine women, now lecturing and writing books to demonstrate that there is no sex in mind, do not adorn a tale, they certainly point the moral of Pope's lines.

"Men, some to quiet, some to public strife,
But every lady would be queen for life."

No distinction in the minds of men and women! Nature flatly contradicts the absurd assertion, and warns against encouraging this foolish and mischievous flattery of women. All attempts to ignore natural well-defined distinctions between the sexes, recoil on both; and, if persisted in, would inflict serious injury on the race. As it is, these doctrines have a most baneful effect in unsettling society. A singular mode of elevating woman truly! To begin by teaching her to despise and shirk all the feminine functions, which constitute the special vocation, pride, joy, and glory of the sex, and woman's natural title to man's love and protection: and all for what? that the pretty dears may play at being men; taking as their models childless disappointed wives and virgins, who undertake to teach mothers!—the strong-minded, or rather weak-minded Gorgons, who declare that man is "played out," and, like them, while forfeiting the real rights and highest privileges of womanhood, become miserable and ridiculous caricatures of men.

Thanks were voted to the author of the paper.

Dr. CHARLES R. DRYSDALE said that though he agreed with much in the papers, he on the whole disagreed more. Mr. Harris had alluded to Adam and Eve; but all such allusions could scarcely be considered as arguments in that Society, many of whose members doubted whether such persons as Adam and Eve ever existed, not that he was of the number. Then it was said that the females of our species were more emotional than the males, while the latter were more muscular. But that was not an universal rule; for in parts of Africa, it was said, the males were weaker than the females, because the latter did all the work. As to mental qualities, it must be admitted that women had not often been philosophers; but it should be borne in mind that they had received no education fitting them to become so, for less money was expended in the education of females. It was not necessary for his argument to say that females are as intellectual as men; but in the papers the authors under-estimated the point at which the intellect of women may arrive, and he thought that they might go much farther in intellectual progress than the authors supposed. As to the assertion that women possess a greater amount of intuition than men, he did not think it was correct. If by intuition it were meant that they came to a conclusion sooner, it might be so; but on the whole he thought the intuition argument went for nothing. Then, there was the professional argument; and

At length she fixed her eye upon a sturdy Quaker, when the following colloquy took place: "Be you one of the Woman's Rights Convention, who think men and women equal?" "I be." "Dost thou think there should be no difference in the treatment of the sexes?" "I do." "Very well, then, stand," was the Quaker's logical reply.

several reasons were adduced why women should not be educated for professions. One of these reasons was that women were ill once a month. That he considered a weak argument, for many women were not periodically ill, in the sense of disease or incapacity; and it was an authorised fact that women generally lived longer than men. As to the alleged loss of time in childbirth, he thought that argument ought not to have been used by Mr. Allan, who was known to be a Malthusian, and an advocate for small families; and if that doctrine were practically applied, there would not be much time lost in child-bearing. With respect to the size of the brain of women, he apprehended that, compared with the size of the body, the brain of a woman was quite equal to, if not greater, than that of a man. All the other arguments opposed to the intellectual equality of women were not of much importance. It should be borne in mind that women had hitherto been kept in great subjection to man. As it was correctly stated in Mr. Mill's book, they could not judge of the intellectual capacity of women by past history, because circumstances had prevented them from being properly developed; and it might be expected that with improved opportunities they would take a more important part in human affairs. The medical and the legal professions, he thought, were both well fitted for women, and as advocates, they were adapted to make a great impression on stupid juries. Neither did he see why they should not enter the church. Even if they could not write sermons, they might buy them, as he knew several clergymen did. He thought that altogether the papers showed too much *animus* against the ladies.

Dr. LANGDON DOWN thought that it might be fairly deduced from the two papers that man and woman were distinct creatures, as they were stated to be in the Mosaic account of the creation. They were not alike, and never would be; and the arguments in the papers proved that nature did not intend them to be alike, but differentiated beings, the one the complement of the other.

Mr. DENDY said that the two papers were somewhat difficult to discuss, because there was in neither of them any point to take hold of. Mr. Harris's paper was a correct moral essay, replete with truisms. If, in criticising Mr. Allan's paper he might observe, his brain seemed so replete with ideas, that he had found it difficult to compress them, and it was consequently too diffuse for discussion. But the great point in both papers seemed to be, that women possess more instinct, and men more intellect: that was true. The constitution of woman was different from that of man. The sympathies of woman were more acute, and she expressed herself accordingly. She was better able than man to judge of character, and her sympathies were more fully called into action. Most of the distinctions in the characters of women might be traced to the influence of the uterus; to the condition of which were to be attributed hysteria, and other affections peculiar to woman. Women felt more acutely than men; but it should be considered that the occupations of man were so various that he could not concentrate his feelings; while women sat at home brooding, perhaps, over some sensational novel, and had

their sympathies more strongly excited. Thus, they were unable to attain a stable state of mind, and went into extremes instead of concentrating their thoughts. Referring to the remarks of Dr. Drysdale, there were certain circumstances with regard to women that made them constantly, even morbidly, susceptible. The processes of nature produced a sensitive diathesis, which prevented them from having the power of mental decision. Periodical menstruation was peculiar to woman, and did not occur in the females of other animals, because it was not required ; for they had not the sexual feeling throughout the year, as woman naturally possessed, but only at peculiar seasons. He was inclined to agree with the authors of both papers ; but he wished they had said something more on which to found an argument.

Mr. LEWIS observed, with regard to the alleged difference between man and woman being attributed to education, that in the Elizabethan era women learnt as much as men ; but since that period men had made immense advances in mechanical and scientific discovery of all kinds, while women had not done anything. As to the general difference between man and woman, he thought it had been well expressed by Mr. Pike in a paper previously read, that woman is intellectually neither superior nor inferior, but is the complement of man.

Dr. HUNT said, in referring to the remarks of Dr. Drysdale on himself, etc., that he would reserve any expression of his views on this subject until some future occasion.

Mr. HIGGINS, who had been alluded to by Dr. Hunt as having paid some attention to the subject, said it appeared to him that, in discussing the asserted natural equality of the sexes, it was necessary to leave out of consideration the reproductive function and the structures directly related thereto. As regards the sexual organs, the course of development is, from an early period of intrauterine life, entirely different in the two sexes, and we have no standard by which to determine relative inferiority or superiority. He believed, however, that in other respects the question of equality might be decided by carefully ascertaining, in the first instance, the differences of form and structure between the average adult man of each race, and the average adult woman, and by thus referring to the special characteristics, the child as standard of comparison. This has already been accomplished to a considerable extent, and the result appears to show that in those respects, in which the adult female differs from the adult male, she approaches the child ; in other words, woman appears to hold an intermediate position between the man and the child. As to the inferiority in the size of the female brain, he thought that Dr. Hunt need not have apologised for want of gallantry in alluding to it ; for we must not take the absolute brain-weight, but should compare it with the size of the body, and so considered, the brain of woman was larger than that of man. He (Mr. Higgins) was, however, bound to add, that in this respect, also, women resembled children. It had been said that women were distinguished from men by having larger organs of the senses ; but he thought that only applied to the eyes, and in that respect, likewise, they approached the child. With regard to the alleged superior intuition of woman, he should like to have

more precise evidence of it. As to the several mental characteristics of women, the subject was, no doubt, a very difficult one; but it seemed worthy of remark that Mr. Harris asserted that there was no distinction of sex in the mind, while Mr. Allan said that there was; and yet these gentlemen appeared to have arrived ultimately at the same conclusion.

Dr. CHARNOCK had only one observation to make on Mr. Harris's paper. The latter made a distinction between plants and the genus *homo*, that in the former both sexes are sometimes found in the same plant. Now, it had never been proved that the human spermatozoon was of any gender, and the gender of the ovum depended upon the time of fecundation; *i. e.*, upon chance. Dr. Charnock spoke on the authority of Pouchet, Hofaeker, Lucas, Huber, and others.

Dr. CARTER BLAKE said he could not comprehend what Mr. Allan meant by "intuition." The word was very vague, and was, as Mr. Allan had used it, in short, nonsense; but by substituting for it "induction," he would remove the difficulty. He objected that no authorities of any weight had been advanced by Mr. Allan to show that women have deductive minds, and men inductive minds. The principal authority on the subject was Mr. Henry T. Buckle's paper, entitled "The Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge," March 19, 1858, in the *Royal Institution Proceedings*, vol. ii, p. 504, which was properly expressed in the language of metaphysics, but Mr. Buckle was not quoted; and if it appeared that Mr. Allan had not read the chief work on the subject that was worth reading, then Mr. Allan's paper, when compared with that of Mr. Buckle, showed many marks of a coincidence which could scarcely be said to be accidental.

Mr. G. HARRIS, in reply, observed, that the difference pursued in the education of women was quite insufficient to account for the difference in their mental condition. As regards literature and the arts, they had as ample education as the men, and far greater leisure. With respect to what had been said about the few great female sovereigns, it should be recollected how rarely women were permitted to ascend the throne; but he did think it an unreasonable anomaly that women should be allowed to rule over nations, and yet be debarred the exercise of common political privileges. He repeated, as he had laid down in his paper, that in mind itself there was no difference in sex,—it was a difference arising entirely out of material organisation, and was not uniformly of either mental or moral superiority on either side.

Mr. J. McGRIGOR ALLAN, in his reply, especially noticed the speech of Dr. Drysdale, a visitor, and thanked that gentleman for his courteous opposition to his views. He was not exactly liable to the rebuke of Mr. Dendy, as he had admitted that it was doubtful if menstruation was a characteristic of female apes and other mammalia. With women, especially in our artificial state of existence, and among those who lived luxuriously, he believed menstruation occupied much longer than the average of two days in the month. The various sexual diseases to which women are liable, rendered it utterly impossible for them, especially for those who fulfilled conjugal and maternal func-

tions, to rival men in arduous professional duties. Even if women had the time, they had not the constitution or temperament which made such duties congenial. As to the law, women were notably deficient in the ability to see two sides of a question, in the cool judgment and impartiality requisite in a judge. With regard to Mr. Lewis's observations, he quite agreed there was no question of absolute superiority in sex. If Mr. Allan had been permitted to finish his paper, he would have told them that the women who find their happiness at home, in promoting the welfare of their husbands and their families, are not only the finest specimens of their sex in every point of view, but are advancing, far more directly and efficiently, the physical, mental, and moral progress of the human species, than those Amazons who prate about the tyranny of man and slavery of women. In reference to the remarks of Mr. Higgins, Mr. A. agreed with that gentleman in describing woman as a kind of adult child. He had drawn attention to Walker's statement, that the organs of sense (not the external organs, but the nerves proceeding to them from the brain), are proportionally larger than in man. Here we might have the true physiological cause of a daily-experienced fact, that man represents intellect, woman instinct,—man reasons, woman feels. Probably Mr. Higgins would yet discover that women are greater adepts than men in dissimulation. Byron, who knew a good deal about the sex, had written—

“Now, what I love in woman is, they won't
Or can't do otherwise than lie, but do it
So well, the very truth seems falsehood to it.”

As he had courteously acknowledged some anatomical information received from Dr. Carter Blake, Mr. Allan regretted that gentleman had not criticised his paper in a more courteous manner. He had depreciated several excellent authorities quoted, because they were novelists. We might learn far more of the characteristic distinctions of the female mind from novelists like Balzac, Thackeray, Charles Reade, etc., than from measuring skulls. Where could we find a more scientific contrast of the characters of Celt and Saxon, than in Scott's novels? Mr. Allan had not read that work of Mr. Buckle referred to, therefore he was not guilty of plagiarism; and as he had been studying the Woman Question for fifteen years, and had frequently published his views thereon, he was quite competent to form an opinion independent of that able writer. Mr. Allan regretted that owing to the manner in which his paper had been brought before the meeting, the discussion on an important anthropological question, then attracting so much attention, should have been of such an unsatisfactory and nugatory character.

JUNE 15TH, 1869.

JOHN BEDDOE, Esq., M.D., President, in the Chair.

THE minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following new Fellows were announced to have been elected :